

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 4-31 were pending. All pending claims were rejected in the Final Rejection. In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments below, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections upon reconsideration.

Substance of the Interview

Preliminarily, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the helpful interview conducted on May 30, 2006. Pursuant to MPEP 713.04, Applicants herein summarize the substance of the interview. Pursuant to the "Summary of Record of Interview Requirements," Applicants refer to the identification of the claims discussed and the principal proposed amendments discussed in the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner, but add that all pending claims were discussed in general terms, and that, specifically, the cancellation of the method of treatment claims and of all the dependent claims reciting the specific types of genes, after these recitations had been added to the independent claims from which they depend.

As the interview was telephonic, no exhibit was shown, nor was any demonstration conducted.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6, 608,037 was also discussed. As Applicants previously advised, however, a terminal disclaimer will be filed upon an indication that the claims are otherwise allowable.

Applicants arguments focused upon the outstanding rejection for alleged lack of enablement. Applicants noted that this rejection focused upon how one identifies what elements should be included in the construct, i.e., which expressible gene, when all that is specified is that the disease is characterized by the presence of TCF/ β -catenin heterodimers. Applicants suggested amending the independent claims to recite the specific types of genes to be included in the construct, and removing the language regarding the characterization of the disease. Applicants maintained, however, that the identification of diseases characterized by the presence of TCF/ β -catenin heterodimers is enabled by the specification as filed, even though the diseases themselves, other than cancer, are not specifically disclosed, because Applicants disclose a method for identifying diseases

so characterized using reporter genes and diseased cells. The utility of the inventions of such claims was acknowledged during the interview including, for example, to remove cancerous cells from tissue for subsequent use.

The Examiner indicated during the interview that making the amendments discussed above would overcome the outstanding enablement rejection.

Amending the claims to remove dependencies upon canceled claims was also discussed. These amendments would overcome the outstanding rejection for indefiniteness.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 2 and 4-31 were rejected in the Final Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly nonenabled. Consistent with the discussion during the interview, claims 2, 9, 12, and 15 have been amended to recite the specific types of genes, and to eliminate the recitation regarding characterization of the disease. Accordingly, claims 4, 29, 30, and 31, have been canceled. Additionally, the method of treatment claims, claims 23-25, have also been canceled.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 4-8, and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for depending upon canceled claims. Specifically, the Office noted that claims 4, 7, 20, 21, 23, and 26 recited claims that had been canceled, with the remaining rejected claims being dependent on one of these former claims. Claims 7, 20, 21, and 26 have been amended to no longer depend upon canceled claims. Claims 4 and 23 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection for obviousness-type double patenting

As noted in the previous response, and reiterated during the interview, Applicants will file a terminal disclaimer upon an indication that the claims are otherwise allowable.

DOCKET NO. HARR0032-101

PATENT

APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 10/607,479

AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DATED JUNE 28, 2006

REPLY TO FINAL REJECTION OF FEBRUARY 22, 2006

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the current application is in condition for allowance and request early notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: June 28, 2006

Michael A. Patané
Registration No. 42,982

For

Doreen Yatko Trujillo
Registration No. 35,719

COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C.
1900 Market Street, 7th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3508
(215) 665-5593 - Telephone
(215) 701-2005 - Facsimile